

I. Gist of Cao Invention

The primary point of novelty, and thus the benefits of Cao Invention, is that bolts (or tightening screws) need not be completely removed.

The last prior art cited teaches a different structure from Cao Invention.

ALL the prior arts **DID NOT TEACH** the disclosed and claimed subject matter of Cao Invention at all.

II. Four(4) of the Five(5) cited prior arts fall into the disadvantaged traditional type of grinding tooth as stated in Cao Invention

1. Wiman et al., #5,810,518 (“Wiman 518 Patent”)

2. Larsson, #6,146,201 (“Larsson 210 Patent”)

3. Bystrom et al., #5,924,826 (“Bystrom 826 Patent”)

4. Eriksson, #4,852,622 (“Eriksson 622 Patent”)

The above FOUR (4) prior art patents (collectively, “Four Patents”) all fall into the disadvantaged type over which Cao Invention seeks to improve.

The Four Patents, by its disclosure as evidenced by the specification including drawing, are the traditional cutting tip (grinding portion) that **requires the complete removal of the bolts/screws** in order to change the tip (grinding portion).

Four Patents structure is exactly Cao Invention teaches NOT to practice.

///

///

1 **III. Last of the Five(5) cited prior arts contains structurally different grinding tooth**

2 The last prior art citation by Examiner gave the patent of Leonardi #5,819,827
3 ("Leonardi 827 Patent").

4 Leonardi 827 Patent achieved the same result that Cao Invention seeks to achieve, i.e.,
5 loosening the bolts/screws when changing the grinding tooth, without complete removal of the
6 bolts/screws.

7 However, Leonardi 827 Patent is structurally different and thus disclosed nothing of
8 Cao Invention.

9 Pursuant to Cao Invention, the grinding tooth **must have slots**, having opening either
10 centripetally or tangentially (or other directions) relative to the disc.

11 In Leonardi 827 Patent, the grinding tooth **has NO slots**.

12 A complete set of Leonardi 827 Patent drawings is attached herein as Exhibit A,
13 showing that Leonardi 827 Patent disclosed and claimed NOTHING related to the feature that
14 grinding teeth would have **slots** on them.

15
16 **IV. Conclusion**

17 As a conclusion, it can be seen that all the cited prior arts are either:

- 18 1. The disadvantaged art that Cao Invention seeks to steer away , or
19 2. Structurally different or irrelevant to Cao Invention; furthermore,
20 3. There is no suggestion to combine any patent to render Cao Invention obvious (in fact,
21 even if all four cited prior arts are combined, they still would not teach Cao Invention.)
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for
2 allowance, and such action is requested.

3
4 Dated: November 16, 2005

Respectfully,

5
6 By: 

7 Jen-Feng (Jeff) Lee
8 Attorney for Applicant
9 Tel: 626-810-7200
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 **Amendment to Specification**

3 [last paragraph in **Field and Background of the Invention**; lines 16 - 18]

4 The disadvantage of the current art is that in order to replace a cutting tooth, the bolts have
5 to be loosened and ~~completed~~ completely removed. It's a time-consuming process when
6 damages to cutting tooth or other parts of the cutting machine require replacement of some
7 teeth.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28